

REMARKS

Rejection of Claims Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Double Patenting

In the Office Action dated November 8, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,342,097.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-stated rejection by the Examiner has been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims 24 and 25.

In the Office Action dated November 8, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 3-6 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,342,097.

Applicants respectfully submit that the afore stated rejection of the Examiner has been rendered moot in light of the amendments to the claims submitted herein. That is, claims 26-29 have been cancelled and newly added dependent claims 47-50 have been incorporated which contain the limitations set forth in the original claims 26-29. That is, original claim 30 has been rewritten as newly added claim 38, a claim indicated allowable by the Examiner, and claims 47-50 depend therefrom. Thus, the newly added independent claims 47-50 depend from a claim indicated allowable by the Examiner and thus contain, in addition to the limitations recited in such claims, each and every limitation of claim 38.

In the Office Action dated November 8, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 2 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,342,097.

Applicants respectfully submit that the afore stated rejection of the Examiner has been rendered moot by cancellation of claims 31 and 32. However, the limitation set forth in such claims are set forth in newly added claims 44 and 45, respectively.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action dated November 8, 2002, the Examiner rejected claims 1-11 and 13-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawargi, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,314,947 in view of Takeshita, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,057,039.

Applicants respectfully submit that the afore stated rejection of the Examiner has been overcome by the present amendment to claim 1. That is, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 12, a claim indicated allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any independent claims. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 12 and thus has been indicated allowable. As such, each of the remaining claims rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103 now depend from a claim indicated allowable by

A

the Examiner and as such contain each and every limitation of the allowed claim in addition to the limitations set forth in each of the dependent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance.

In addition to claim 12, the Examiner indicated that claims 30 and 33-37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, newly added independent claims 38 and 39 have been added to satisfy the Examiner's requirements and claims 40-44 have been added as dependent claims containing the limitations of original claims 33-37. Newly added claim 45 meets each and every requirement set forth by the Examiner for patentability and newly added claims 46-51 depend from a claim indicated allowable.

Lastly, newly added independent claim 52 satisfies the Examiner's rejection as to overcoming the double patenting rejection and is a claim indicated allowable by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that this application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider each and every rejection as applicable to the claims now pending in the application and pass such claims to issue.

A

This amendment is intended to be a complete response to the Office
Action dated November 8, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,



Glen M. Burdick, Reg. No. 24,230
DUNLAP, CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
Post Office Box 16370
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73113
(405) 478-5344 - Telephone
(405) 478-5349 - Telefax

Attorney for Applicants.

A